



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,051	11/27/2001	Sami Mikkonen	915.409	7455

7590 06/12/2003

Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys  
& Adolphson LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, PO Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WIMER, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2821	

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 09/993,051	Applicant(s) MIKKONEN ET AL.
	Examiner Michael C. Wimer	Art Unit 2821
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
<p>THE REPLY FILED <u>9/4/03</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>		
<b>PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]</b>		
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.		
b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.		
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p>		
<p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</li> <li>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li> </ul>		
<p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u>.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u>.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u>.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u>.</p>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		



Michael C. Wimer  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2821

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The added language of a specific antenna type (i.e., a PIFA), and a "non-self-repeating on smaller scales"...surface, was neither considered nor addressed at the time of final Office action. Specifically, Claims 1 and 7 now recite a specific antenna type, never before considered because it was not claimed. The PIFA is explained in the specification to be a conventional antenna type. The invention of Fig. 4b is described as a "shaped PIFA". The invention of Figures 2 and 3 cannot be considered "planar" and when the term PIFA is associated with such structure, or claimed as such, it results in a confusing arrangement. The preamble of Claims 1 and 7 now specifically recite a "planar" antenna with a non-planar radiator surface. This is a contradiction and makes the claim indefinite. The claims do not identify the antenna as a "shaped PIFA" as set forth in the specification. However, if such a term were used, associated structural detail must be set forth. The negative limitation, "non-self-repeating on smaller scales..." is indefinite, was never a consideration and is deemed to be new matter since it does not appear to have been originally disclosed as a requirement for the invention. In view of applicant's amendments to the claims, intended to be entered, an additional search would have to be performed and additional consideration in terms of rejections would have to be made to these claims.